REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are now pending in the application and stand rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

At the outset, Applicant notes that various individual elements recited in the claims (including but not limited to browsers and servers) are stated in the Office Action to be known elements. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims also recite various interrelationships among the elements that should be considered by the Office. For example, as discussed below, independent claims 9 and 17 include recitations that were not addressed in the Office Action. It is important that the written record clearly explain the rationale for decisions made during prosecution of the application. MPEP 706.02(j). When determining whether a claim is obvious, an examiner must make a searching comparison of the claimed invention - *including all its limitations* – with the teaching of the prior art. In re Ochiai, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully requests, in the event that the Office finds it necessary to reject any of the claims based on the claim elements discussed below with reference to claims 9 or 17, that the next office action not be made final so that Applicant may have the opportunity to traverse one proper prior art rejection.

Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 11 and 14 (and apparently claim 13) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,013 to McElreath in

view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,575 to Schmidt et al., ("Schmidt") and further in view of U.S. 2003/0014426 to Gimbert et al. ("Gimbert"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to recite "...a portable computer having a processor and memory configured for connection with a plurality of components of the aircraft to retrieve data from one or more modules of the aircraft components; the processor and memory configured to, when the portable computer is operating standalone: execute a web server module resident in the portable computer to include at least some of the retrieved data in one or more web page markups for providing a plurality of maintenance and/or engineering functions selectable by a user of the computer and performable via the computer as to one or more of the components of the aircraft; and execute a web browser module resident in the portable computer and in communication with the server module to display the one or more web page markups as one or more web pages on a display of the portable computer." (emphasis added)

Gimbert describes information about the design of aircraft. The computers 14 of Gimbert are connected to enterprise servers 12 (FIG. 2) and are not disclosed as receiving information from an aircraft. Further, there apparently is no disclosure in McElreath, Schmidt or Gimbert of a server and a browser both resident on the same computer. Of the three references, only Gimbert discloses browser-server interaction, which is disclosed as taking place over a network as known in the art. Therefore none of the cited references teach or suggest "...the processor and memory configured to, when the portable computer is operating standalone: execute a web server module resident in the portable computer to include at least some of the retrieved data in one or more web page markups ...; and execute a web browser module resident in the portable computer

and in communication with the server module to display the one or more web page markups as one or more web pages on a display of the portable computer" as recited in claim 1 as amended.

As to independent claim 9, the Office Action does not appear to have addressed the recitations "...said formatting performed by the processor using server and browser modules resident in the computer...". Further, there apparently is no disclosure in McElreath, Schmidt or Gimbert of both a server and a browser resident on the same computer. For at least the foregoing reason, Applicant submits that claim 9 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Claim 13 is amended to recite "...the construct processing module configured to obtain data from the configuration file using a common gateway interface (CGI) of the server that does not interface with an internet."

There is no explicit disclosure in McElreath, Schmidt or Gimbert of a CGI. Therefore McElreath, Schmidt and Gimbert cannot teach or suggest the recitations of claim 13 is amended.

As to independent claim 14, the claim is amended to recite "...using a server module resident in the computer and a browser module resident in the computer, viewing the retrieved data and one or more user-selectable management functions relating to the retrieved data on a display of the computer in one or more web pages formatted and displayed by a processor of the computer executing the server and browser modules; the method performed without accessing the Internet."

There apparently is no disclosure in McElreath, Schmidt or Gimbert of both a server and a browser resident on the same computer. Accordingly, there is no

disclosure of McElreath, Schmidt or Gimbert of the use of such a browser and server together without accessing the Internet. For at least the foregoing reason, Applicant submits that claim 14 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Claims 2, 7, 8, 10, 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt, in further view of U.S. 2003/0208579 to Brady, JR. et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously discussed, claims 1 and 14 (upon which claims 2, 7 and 8 and 15-16 respectively depend) have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 7-8 and 15-16 should be allowed in view of the cited references. Also as discussed previously, the recitations of independent claim 9 (upon which claim 10 depends) are not obvious in view of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 10 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Claims 17 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt in view of Gimbert and further in view of Brady. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to independent claim 17, the Office Action does not appear to have analyzed the recitation "...a user request received via a browser module and web server module of the portable computer..." (emphasis added). As previously discussed, there apparently is no disclosure in McElreath, Schmidt or Gimbert of both a server and a browser resident on the same computer. For at least the foregoing reason, Applicant submits that claim 17 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Additionally, claim 22 is amended to recite "... the processor processing one or more constructs to include dynamic content in a web page, the processing performed

using a construct processing module of the server to obtain the data via a common gateway interface (CGI), the CGI executable in the computer when the computer is standalone."

None of the references cited describe using a CGI in a standalone computer. Therefore claim 22 as amended should be allowable in view of the cited references.

Claims 6 and 12 (and possibly claim 18) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt, and further in view of Official Notice. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously discussed, claim 1 (upon which claim 6 depends) has been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 should be allowed in view of the cited references. Also as discussed previously, the recitations of independent claims 9 and 17 are not obvious. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 12 and 18 are not obvious in view of the cited references.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Schmidt, Gimbert and Brady, and further in view of Official Notice. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed previously, Applicant submits that the recitations of independent claim 17 are not obvious in view of Schmidt, Gimbert and Brady. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the recitations of claim 18 are not obvious in view of the cited references.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 28, 2009

By: _____
Elizabeth D. Odell, Reg. No. 39,532

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

EDO/nr